

October 17, 2002

Ms. Cynthia Villarreal-Reyna
Section Chief - Agency Counsel Section
Legal & Compliance Division, MC 110-1A
Texas Department of Insurance
P.O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714-9104

OR2002-5903

Dear Ms. Villarreal-Reyna:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. The request was assigned ID# 170830.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for information related to the screening criteria used by Crawford and Company for the denial and approval of claims. The department claims that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The department has notified Crawford and Company and McKesson Health Solutions ("McKesson")¹ of the request for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions claimed and have reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. The department asserts that the submitted screening criteria is confidential pursuant to section 4(i) of article 21.58A of the Insurance Code. Section 4(i) of article 21.58A provides:

¹ McKesson's proprietary interests may be implicated by the request because McKesson licensed the use of its screening criteria product, InterQual, by Crawford and Company.

Each utilization review agent shall utilize written medically acceptable screening criteria and review procedures which are established and periodically evaluated and updated with appropriate involvement from physicians, including practicing physicians, dentists, and other health care providers. Utilization review decisions shall be made in accordance with currently accepted medical or health care practices, taking into account special circumstances of each case that may require deviation from the norm stated in the screening criteria. Screening criteria must be objective, clinically valid, compatible with established principles of health care, and flexible enough to allow deviations from the norms when justified on a case-by-case basis. Screening criteria must be used to determine only whether to approve the requested treatment. Denials must be referred to an appropriate physician, dentist, or other health care provider to determine medical necessity. Such written screening criteria and review procedures shall be available for review and inspection to determine appropriateness and compliance as deemed necessary by the commissioner and copying as necessary for the commissioner to carry out his or her lawful duties under this code, provided, however, that any information obtained or acquired under the authority of this subsection and article is confidential and privileged and not subject to the open records law or subpoena except to the extent necessary for the commissioner to enforce this article.

Ins. Code art. 21.58A § 4(i) (emphasis added). The department states that the submitted information consists of screening criteria that is part of the utilization review plan of Crawford and Company, and is the type of information made confidential under section 4(i) of article 21.58A. Based on these representations, we agree that the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with article 21.58A of the Insurance Code, and must be withheld by the department.²

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days.

² As we are able to make this determination, we do not address the remaining arguments submitted to this office.

Id. § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. Id. § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Kristen Bates

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

KAB/seg

Ref: ID# 170830

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Frances MacDonald
Northshore Orthopedics
P.O. Box 24247
Houston, Texas 77229-4247
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Gayla C. Crain Epstein Becker Green Wickliff & Hall, P.C. 12750 Merit Drive, Suite 1320 Dallas, Texas 75251-1219 (w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Missailidis Assistant General Counsel McKesson Health Solutions, L.L.C. 275 Grove Street, Suite 1-10 Newton, Massachusetts 02466-2273 (w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sharon Darrigan Crawford & Company 200 Glenridge Point Parkway, Suite 300 Atlanta, Georgia 30342 (w/o enclosures)